

Env. in Jan

A

Controversy on Slavery,

BETWEEN

GEORGE FITZHUGH, ESQ.,

Of Virginia,

Author of "SOCIOLOGY FOR THE SOUTH," etc.,

AND

A. HOGEBOOM, ESQ.,

Of New York.

ONEIDA, N. Y.:

PRINTED AT THE "ONEIDA SACHEM" OFFICE.

1857.

A

Controversy on Slavery,

BETWEEN

GEORGE FITZHUGH, ESQ.,

Of Virginia,

Author of "SOCIOLOGY FOR THE SOUTH," etc.,

AND

A. HOGEBOOM, ESQ.,

Of New York.



ONEIDA, N. Y.:

PRINTED AT THE "ONEIDA SACHEM" OFFICE.

1857.

00718-09

A/S collection

326.973
F 578C

719033

Correspondence.

LETTER FROM GEORGE FITZHUGH.

PORT ROYAL, Va., Sept. 26th, 1856.

A. HOGEBOOM, ESQ :

Dear Sir:—Your letter addressed to me in the *Liberator* of Sept. 1st, has this moment met my observation. Probably you have just cause to upbraid and taunt me for not taking up the guage of battle which you threw down. I did not do so because I feared a little fight between you and me. It would be unproductive of consequences. But, Sir, you show pluck, pertinacity, moral courage, and philanthropy. I believe you are honest, conscientious, and well-intentioned. I think you wish the Right should prevail. I hope "*Fiat justitia ruat cælum*," is your maxim and your guide. So thinking, and so believing, I enter on the controversy which you invite. Yet, Sir, let me admonish you that the subjects we are to discuss involve all the history of mankind; that no one man is competent to treat of them; and that he who attempts it, should add to native abilities and enlarged experience and observation learning as varied and profound as human nature can attain to. I at once admit and deplore my deficiencies and short-comings in all these respects, and would not encourage you, if I thought you more than mortal.

Let us, Sir, with a deep sense of our own weakness, ignorance and unworthiness, approach "the height of this great argument." Let us seek only to elucidate, expound and estab-

lish truth, "Nor aught extenuate, nor aught set down in malice."

We have not agreed precisely as to what is the issue between us; but it seems to me that you hold the affirmative—that you are the accuser—and that I am only called on to defend Slavery against your charges, arguments and proofs:

First—Because the Abolitionists, of whom you are one, for half a century have denounced Slavery, and been actively engaged in attempts to abolish it. It is their duty and yours to show that it is wrong before you can justify your denunciations, or expect us to heed your advice.

Secondly—Domestic Slavery, as an institution of society, was universal in the civilized world until three or four centuries since, and now very generally prevails, whilst Universal Liberty is exceptional and experimental. You must, therefore, prove that your little, short-lived experiment has been attended with success, and has, in the general and the aggregate, improved the moral, physical and religious condition of the laboring class, or manumitted slaves, and also benefited, or not injured, society at large—or, at least, that it has promoted "the greatest good of the greatest number."

I warn you, that whilst I shall not confine myself to defensive warfare, I shall claim the victory, unless you prove from history, statistics, and general human experience, *that the evils of Free Society are less than those of Slave Society, and that the little experiment of Universal Liberty has been attended with success.*

I am ready to institute a comparison of the merits of Slave society, and of those forms of society that have succeeded to it—but not to weigh against each other the advantages of the actual and the speculative.

I will not fight shadows, nor contend with Utopians. Whilst I do not undertake to deny that the Socialists *may* discover a new social science, or get up a millenium, I shall confine my defence and my assaults to the practical, the real, and the existing. It will be time to challenge our approbation and ask our imitation of the ten thousand conflicting schemes of the Socialists, when some one of them has been fairly tested on a sufficient scale and for a sufficient length of time. 'Till then, all Abolitionists are bound to prove "that the ascertained evils of Free Society are less than those of Slave Society."

Having thus given you my ideas of the controversy we are

about to engage in, I will throw out a few suggestions for your consideration—admitting, at the same time, that as you hold the affirmative, you have the right to begin the discussion. I shall, therefore, not complain if, in your reply, instead of answering the objections or facts or arguments that I employ, you march directly up to the attack, begin with the first liberation of European serfs, the first experiment of free society, and show that from first to last, in the general, it has promoted “the greatest good of the greatest number,” or at least benefited the laboring liberated class.

OBJECTIONS TO ABOLITION.

First—It should prove that domestic slavery is a violation of the dictates of man’s nature, for it is fair to presume that a benevolent and beneficent and all-wise God has not given to man, His favorite creature, made after His own image, a nature that impels him, in the general, to practices destructive of his own happiness and well-being. Abolition should, in the first place, show that domestic slavery is contrary to common usage, and, therefore, unnatural and wrong; yet it has been almost universal, and is, therefore, natural and right.

Secondly—Abolition, failing in this, should prove that as man rises in civilization, in religion, and in general intelligence, he dispenses with domestic slavery. Yet the contrary is true. Until three centuries ago, slavery was universal among the virtuous, religious and civilized; universal liberty only existed among savages and Cannibals. The Athenians—the most highly civilized people that ever existed—had most slaves. Civilization and Slavery, with slight exceptions, have gone hand in hand. Now, Mexico and South America (except Brazil) are barbarous, because they have abolished slavery—and even Northern and Western Europe would starve or become barbarous if they were not fed, clothed and sustained by the profits of trade with slave countries.

Thirdly—The Abolitionists ought to show that the Bible condemns slavery. They cannot do so, because slavery was instituted by God’s express command, and is recognized, approved and regulated throughout the Bible. Hence abolition and free society are coextensive in time and space with infidelity. Henry Ward Beecher says four-fifths of the intelligent and moral young men of the North are infidels. Mr. Hoge.

boom could not find in a month a single *young* intelligent man *born* and *reared* at the South who is an infidel.

Fourthly—They should show that emancipation has improved in Europe (where society is in its common and normal condition) the physical comforts of the laboring class; yet so far from proving this, they well know that the preambles, recitals and enactments of the English poor laws, and the concurrent testimony of all English historians, prove that mendicity, pauperism and vagrancy commenced with free society, and have increased as it increased, till three hundred thousand of the emancipated starved to death in Ireland in a single season, whilst famine, and death from famine, raged in England and Scotland at the same time. They also know that famine has become the normal condition of the whole laboring class of Western Europe, because they are *free*, whilst slaves in all ages and in all countries have been comfortably fed, clad and housed.

Fifthly—The abolitionists should prove that the liberation of slaves increases their morality; but the reverse is true.—There is double as much crime in free society as in slave society, as all history, censuses and statistics exhibit.

Sixthly—They should prove that free society is more religious than slave society; but religion, faith, conviction have disappeared from free society as effective agencies. Every thing is at sea—nothing fixed or established in morals, religion, or in government, whilst in slave society all men are conservatives and believers in christianity. All are enjoying physical comfort—all opposed to insurrection—all comparatively contented.

Seventhly—Government is inadequate and insufficient without slavery. Hence, so soon as the serfs were liberated in Europe, there appeared in society a numerous class of nomadic beggars, pickpockets, gypsies, highwaymen, and robbers, and mobs, riots and revolutions commenced; and hence, the ordinary police was increased, and standing armies became necessary. Masters supply the place of a police and standing armies and of a criminal code. Rome had scarcely any criminal code, because the masters ruled that class who commit crimes, and thus prevented crime. Law, mere law, is inadequate to govern the mass of mankind; they need masters, or censors, or Spanish inquisitions, or King Alfreds, tithing-men, or the early witch-hanging and Quaker-hanging clergy of New England. The

mass must have masters of some sort—must have men about them whose “will stands for law.” The proletariat of France, the lazaroni of Italy, the gypsies of Spain and of all Western Europe, the nomadic beggars and pauper banditti of England, and the leperos of México, are the loathsome outgrowth of free society, and all need *masters* to govern them. Slavery is quite as indispensable to govern the vicious as to protect and provide for the weak.

Eighthly—Agriculture being the worst paid and compensated labor, the world must continually starve and go naked without slavery. Now slave society, by its agricultural surplus, feeds and clothes free society in Europe and America. Every body in free society avoids agricultural labor, because, though the most meritorious, it is the worst paid of all labor. Not so in slave society. The farming negro has double the allowance of the English or Yankee hireling, and none of his care and anxiety. There is no animal in the world so badly treated, or as badly situated in all respects, as a free hireling farm laborer in Europe or America—probably none so well situated as a Southern farm slave. He is sure to labor no more than will promote his health, for he is too valuable to have his health or strength endangered; and for the same reason he is sure of plentiful feeding, clothing and house room. He has no cares for the present or the future, and labors just enough to prevent ennui and promote health. His morals are safe—first, because he has no temptation to immorality, and secondly, because the master’s interest secures the enforcement of morality. An immoral slave is worth nothing; an ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed slave is worth nothing; a discontented, unhappy slave is worth nothing.

Ninthly—Christian morality is impracticable in free society, because any man being thrown on his own merits, any man having his selfish interests opposed to those of all other men, finds that he can only “be true to himself by doing wrong to others.” Competition, rivalry, antagonism, social war become from necessity universal. The Christian dispensation was preached to slave society, when in the general we most advance our selfish interest by promoting the interests of others. There is no clashing of interests, no rivalry, no competition or antagonism in the family composed of wife, children, and slaves. Each finds his own good most advanced by promoting the good

of others. The master, father and husband is happiest and most prosperous when he consults the happiness and well-being of wife, children, and slaves, and "does unto them as he would be done by;" and they are happiest and best conditioned when they follow his example. Christian morality is natural and profitable in slave society—unnatural, suicidal and impracticable in free society, for free society is always in a state of competitive war, a war of the wits—a war far more ignoble, selfish and ungenerous than the war of the sword.

Tenthly—The abolitionists are all socialists and communists, and, as such, assert that the experiment of free society is an intolerable failure. All agree with Carlyle and Andrews, "that we must have a new world if we are to have any world at all!" So far as I am advised, not one abolitionist is satisfied with the system of society in which he lives. Some would have all property in common; some would have no religion; some no churches or priests; some no marriage; some no law; some no government. None, not one, asks us of the South to imitate their present institutions. Each one says they are intolerable. In France, Germany, England and Northern America, whilst all agree that the form of "free society" which you have established is intolerable, you require of us of the South to change, to do something to abolish slavery. Now agree upon something that we shall do after having abolished slavery.—Show us that you of New York, New England, and Western Europe, have discovered something WITH WHICH YOU ARE SATISFIED, AND WHICH IS BETTER THAN DOMESTIC SLAVERY.

I will advocate abolition if you can show that universal liberty, that your form of society promotes general happiness and well-being. Attached, as I am, to the "King's division," believing that the good of one of the great and gifted is rather to be consulted than the good of many of "Natick cobblers and Waltham factory hands" of the Garrisonian stripe, I will agree and consent that slavery is wrong, and should be abolished, if you can prove that the "greater number of featherless bipeds" will be physically better off by its abolition. I think that nine-tenths of mankind are best off when they are ridden with a tight rein, and plentiful applications of the whip and spur. I give you a great advantage, for I believe such is the opinion of all Southern men whose opinion is worth consulting.

Eleventhly—All government should be adapted to the wants

and necessities of the governed and to the good of society.— But much the larger portion of mankind are either too modest and delicate and weak, like woman, for the rough-roll-and-tumble competition of the world; like children, too weak and ignorant and improvident for such competition; or like the mass of the adult males, both too improvident and too vicious for self-government, or the government of mere law. Such, embracing nine-tenths, probably nineteen-twentieths of mankind, require masters as well to protect and to provide for them as to govern them. Without such masters, husbands and guardians, they become the oppressed substratum of society, like the “thirty thousand middle women” of London, the beggars, the thieves, the gypsies, the lazaroni, the factory hands, the agricultural laborers, the nomadic banditti, the unemployed poor, the leperos, the proletariat of your society, and other common day laborers. Slavery protects, provides for and elevates the mass. The fifty thousand unemployed laborers in New York last winter, with their fifty thousand starving children, would have been better off with masters. We see that a meeting in the Park, last spring, “Resolved, that there were fifty thousand males seeking employment.” Last winter the slaves of the South were generally unemployed, but it was a feast and holiday time with them. No slave was short of clothes, food, or house room.

Twelfthly—Charity is a dangerous if not impracticable virtue in free society, for if we cannot control the conduct and expenditure of our beneficiaries, we but levy taxes from the virtuous and laboring poor to give to the idle and vicious poor. We may safely be charitable and generous to our slaves, because we can see that our gifts are employed to promote their welfare; but what we give to the free is very generally promotive of idleness, improvidence and crime. Hence, good men are all ambitious, and desire power, for without power, despotic power, no one can be safely and securely beneficent or charitable.

Thirteenthly—Universal liberty is contrary to the course of nature. Order, adaptation and subordination are found throughout the material and moral world. Equality prevents order and adaptation, and begets chaos and anarchy. Each seeks and claims the same place, and actual war and conflict is the consequence. The riots, mobs, famines, heresies, super-

stitutions, infidelities and revolutions of free society prove that this competition, antagonism, rivalry, war and anarchy are begotten by such society, without any hopes of settlement or permanent peace, order, subordination, faith, or contentment.

The advocates of free society allege that lands are dearer and labor cheaper than with us. This is a double assertion that free laborers are less *free* than negro slaves. The profits of land constitutes its value and regulates its price. The profits are what the land owner extracts from the hireling or slave laborer, and where the laborer is permitted in any form to retain and enjoy most of those profits, there lands are cheapest. 'Tis because we allow more of those profits to our slaves than you do to your white laborers, that your lands are dearer than ours. They sell still higher in Europe, where laborers work longer hours, and are kept half starving and half housed and clothed.

"Free labor is cheaper than slave labor," because the employer pays or allows the hireling less of the products of his own labor than we allow our slave. Dear lands and cheap labor indicate, nay, demonstrate the harsh and grinding slavery of the laboring class. Despite of names, that society is freest where lands are cheapest—that most enslaved where lands are dearest.

Fourteenthly—"Land monopoly" is felt to be an intolerable evil, and "land reform" is a favorite scheme in New York.—That is, Mr. Hogeboom, you see that slavery to capital, as it exists among you, is too harsh and exacting for human beings to bear. Mr. Goodell, your great abolition author, expressly says it is more cruel and "*murderous*" than feudal slavery. You have not the *name* slavery among you, but you have the *thing* in its most cruel form. Read the work of your able philosopher, Stephen Peale Andrews, on the "Science of Society," and you will see how slavery does exist in (so called) free society.

Fifteenthly—All socialists, indeed I might say, all men agree that the common laboring class and all the weaker members of society require more of protection than is now afforded them. But, to protect men, we must have the power of controlling them. We must first enslave them before we can protect them. This is done in the instances of lunatics and idiots, wives, children, wards and apprentices. Is it not equally hu-

mane and necessary in the case of negroes, who, as a class, require protection as much as white women or white children over fifteen?

Sixteenthly—Socialism, which is almost universal in free society in America as well as Europe, is but a confession of social bankruptcy, an almost universal assertion that "free society is a failure." 'Tis the half-way house between such society and slavery. Mr. Carlyle, a socialist, already proposes slavery as the remedy. He sees that society is all unstrung, and needs screwing up—that "the world is too little governed." After a few more social experiments like Fourier's and Owens', and Andrews' Free Love, and Oneida Perfectionism, and Mormonism, and Shakerism, &c., &c., all ending in total failures, your socialists and abolitionists will confess that domestic slavery is the true remedy. "All, all agree that free society, as now existing, is a hopeless failure." And America echoes back to Europe the appalling words of Carlyle—"We must have a new world if we are to have any world at all!"

Seventeenthly—Socialism and communism agree with slavery, and are right in repudiating the anti-social principles of Lock's social contract and Adam Smith's "let alone and competition doctrines." These philosophers have mistaken man's nature. He is a social or gregarious animal, born in society to which he belongs. Society is the *being*—individuals its members. Aristotle's is the true philosophy, (see his Politics and Economics,) which is founded on the assumption of man's social nature, and which shows slavery to be natural and necessary to protect and govern the weaker members of society. Free society disintegrates and reduces to separate and conflicting monads, or human atoms, the natural associations, even the family itself—first by freeing the slaves, next the wives, and finally, we suppose, the children.

Slavery, besides associating men more closely as the socialists propose, also associates labor and capital, and thus renders them more productive. It also agrees with communism in supplying each one according to his wants, and not according to his labor. It is far superior to either in this, that the head of the association owning its members is impelled alike by domestic affection and self-interest to take good and kindly care of them. Man takes the best care of that property which is most valuable. Slaves are not only the most valuable prop-

erty, but they are *weak and dependent human beings*, and we can't help loving what is frail and dependent.

Free laborers are at constant war with their employers. They seek high wages—the employers struggle to depress wages—and also at war with each other, by underbidding to get employment. Hence, the free laborer is treated worse and fares worse than any other animal on an English farm; and hence the slave always fares and is treated far better than mere brute animals.

Eighteenthly—I will now attempt to expound more philosophically the theory, the practice and “modus operandi” of (so called) free society.

Every man in such society (and it is, to a limited extent, the case in slave society) is trying, might and main, to enslave his white fellow men, to enjoy the profits of their labor without being burdened with taking care of them, providing for them, protecting or governing them—for every man is trying to become independent, endeavoring to accumulate property, whose property shall support him without labor. But all the profits of capital or of property are purely and merely the results of some one's labor. The capitalist or property holder intends, and generally does, retain his principal or capital intact, and live upon his rents, profits and interest. Now rents, profits and interest are but the tax which capital exacts from labor. Capitalists or property holders pay labor nothing, but only allow the laborers a part of their own earnings, less than we allow our slaves—and hence, “free labor is cheaper than slave labor.” The man who has amassed in capital or property fifty thousand dollars, who retains it, and yet derives from it an income of three thousand dollars, is just as much a slave owner as a Southern planter. He employs it to command, to tax, or exploitate laborers of that amount annually. Property or capital neither breeds nor increases. Hence, the Bible forbids all “usury,” interest, or “increase.” See 23 Deut. and 25 Leviticus. The man with fifty thousand dollars owns about fifty white slaves, taking them in families, for three thousand dollars a year is as much as fifty such can produce, after barely supporting themselves and families. These fifty laborers are *compelled* to work or starve. They have as little liberty in this respect as slaves—in fact less, for they have to labor harder and longer, and fare worse. But the capitalist, whose whole

revenue and support are derived from their labor, cares nothing for them—in fact, generally hates them, and is under no legal obligation to protect, govern and provide for them. *He* is a master without the cares, anxieties and responsibilities of a master. “*They* are slaves without the rights of slaves”—“Slaves without (legal) masters.”

Capital forces laborers to work for nothing. Skill exchanges a very little light labor for a great deal of hard, coarse labor. The lawyer, the doctor, the merchant, the dentist, the manufacturer and the skillful mechanic make slaves of their fellow men by exchanging the results of one day's light labor for the results of ten or twenty days' coarse labor. Thus, the lawyer owns twenty or thirty common laborers—the skillful mechanic five or six.

All men in free society are busily engaged in the white slave trade, and he who succeeds best is considered most meritorious. The millionaire, who commands and exploits the labor of a thousand, is almost worshiped—the great lawyer, who makes his hundreds dollars a day, and owns, therefore, a hundred laborers, is highly respected—but the poor laborers, whom every body lives by, and whom every body exploits, are despised.

Your scale of merit (I wish it were not too true every where) is like the Indian's—“He is most meritorious who can show most scalps.” I like best the Indian mode of taking them—the “*aut eita sur, aut victoria læta*,” to the more ignoble and cruel war of the wits and free trade.

There is, however, but little of this competition or exploitation in slave society. It does not exist within the family.—Masters, wives, children and slaves do not *compete with one another*, but in the general “love one another, and do unto each other as they would be done by.” There is just enough of it to incite to enterprise and progress.

Nineteenthly—In slave society, the master and mistress must labor in superintending, governing and taking care of the slaves and of the farm. All the cares, anxieties and responsibilities of life are incurred by them. The slaves have no cares, and are the happiest people in the world—much happier than their owners. But in free society the rich have nothing to do but lounge about the streets in the day, and go to Free Love saloons or the theatre at night. Slave society makes all men working men. You will find that Paley, in his *Moral Philoso-*

phy, in the chapter on "The treatment of our domestics and dependents," holds my doctrine, that labor produces every thing; that the rich pay the laborers nothing for their labor, but only "distribute what others produce." But this whole subject is handled in the most masterly manner by Stephen Peale Andrews in his "Science of Society." I think it, so far as its philosophy is *destructive*, the greatest book of the age—so far as it is *constructive*, the wildest and most chimerical. But Mr. Andrews is on the right track. After the failure of a few more of his experiments, he will find that domestic slavery is the great moral and social and religious panacea.

Twentiethly—Slaves emancipated from the dominion of separate human masters are at once remitted to the dominion, the exaction and exploitation of skill and capital. They have to work harder and longer, and fare worse, as the history of free society invariably shows. They are less free and worse off in all respects after liberation than before.

I will not extend this letter, because I prefer to recommend to the reader to examine the history of free society for himself. He will be aided in this examination by a work on "Liberty and Slavery" by Professor Bledsoe, by a work about to appear by Professor William A. Smith, and by my Sociology for the South, and another work I am about to publish, entitled "Cannibals All, or Slaves without Masters."

Since writing the above, I found your letter to me of 12th April, which I had mislaid. I have anticipated answers to much of it in what I have already written.

You complain of the sale of negroes. This is sometimes a great evil, for the tie between master and slave is one of warm, mutual attachment. Misfortune, speculation and extravagance sometimes compel the sundering of those ties; but good servants are very generally bought by good masters in the neighborhood. The severing of family ties, except for crime, is probably as rare with the slaves, or more rare, than with the whites in the old States, North or South. The navy, the army and the merchant service alone separate more white families than all causes combined separate black ones. Emigration to the West and South goes on *pari passu* with whites and blacks, and equally sunders their family ties.

I presume instances of improper intercourse between hirelings and employers are as common at the North as between

master and slave here. The very breath of scandal has never raised a rumor of but two cases within ten miles of this village in the last twenty-seven years, in which circumference there is a white and black population of about five thousand. Delicacy forbids our dwelling on this subject. But, sir, the census shows there is less of crime, and of pauperism, which impels to crime, at the South, than any where else. There is not an indelicate, profane, infidel or agrarian press or periodical at the South, because there are no readers for such literature. A public opinion that will not tolerate the bare mention of what is gross, licentious, infidel or agrarian, is not likely to tolerate the perpetration of what it will not permit even to be discussed.

Besides, crime of all kind occur most frequently with the ignorant and the paupering laboring class. This class are our slaves, and are restrained from crime by their masters. Those of our whites who can neither read or write are still generally proud, privileged, sensible men, who avoid vice because they have little temptation to commit it, and because it tends to level them with the free negroes, the only vicious class among us.

Tired of writing, I just now walked out and met my friend and neighbor R. He is past middle life, owns a farm of some 800 acres and about thirty negroes, within a few miles of this village and not far from the Rappahannock, a navigable river. He has never had a key to his corn-house, and always permitted one of his negroes to keep the key of his meat-house; yet he is a prosperous, money-making man. His is an exceptional case with us, but the common practice in such parts of the South and West as afford an opportunity for trading with white pedlers and skippers.

In general, at all times and in all countries, the physical wants of the slave are abundantly supplied. Man is not man, does not begin to have intellectual, moral, religious or social wants until his animal wants are decently supplied.

When the mass of free laborers in old countries are generally assured of continual physical comfort, you may begin to compare slave society with free society; but until you have discovered some social organization that will neutralize the exacting, starving, crushing despotism of capital, skill and free competition, both theory and experience should warn you that abolition is a hopeless cause.

My letter to you published in the *SACHEM*, your reply published in the same, this communication, and your reply to it, will probably suffice for one pamphlet. You can publish such a pamphlet at once if you choose. Your reply to this I can answer, if I think necessary, in another pamphlet. You need not defer publishing until I see your reply.

With much respect, your obedient servant,

GEORGE FITZHUGH.

REPLY OF A. HOGEBOOM.

SHED'S CORNERS, Madison County, N. Y., }
December 23d, 1856. }

GEORGE FITZHUGH, ESQ.:

Dear Sir:—I answered yours of September 26th by snatches in pencil, as I found opportunity amid pressing engagements. I now copy and revise my scraps.

The feeling strongest in my mind is that of pungent regret that so able a pen as yours should be wielded in strengthening the ultra pro-slaveryism that rules the South. Were you merely an opposer of the immediate emancipation of the present set of slaves, the world would hear you patiently.

But be true to your convictions, my noble friend. God, and God only, knows the ordeal which the South is reserving for itself. Man must derive his wisdom from the experience of the past; and the world is so constituted that whatever is allowed to take place will work for the good of the race. We are all to act according to our honest convictions, and leave the event with God. If you at the South are so desperately wedded to slavery that nothing short of a bloody revolution will cure you of the malady, God will permit the calamity to take place, and future ages will profit from your experience.

As your letter is somewhat lengthy, I must study brevity in my replies, even at the risk of being thought desultory. I can only notice the more salient points. To reply *seriatim*, would fill a volume.

I positively decline your arrangement of shifting me over to the affirmative. It would be utterly superfluous for me to

labor to induce a conviction that rises spontaneously or intuitively in every mind not warped by prejudice. The grounds of my attack on your "Sociology for the South" was simply the inadequacy of your proof that *slave society* is preferable to *free society*.

The question is not whether slavery is *right*, or whether it is *wrong*, in the *abstract*; but whether society is better with than without slavery. It is not enough for you to prove free society a "failure:" you must prove that slave society has not been a still greater failure.

Is it instituting "shadows" and "utopias" to invite a comparison between the actual and real? If, in reality, I have deviated from this, I am obliged to you for the correction.—We will take the actual conditions of free society and of slave society as they now exist in the United States. You must admit, however, that if you were the gainer by a comparison of the results of the two forms of society, it would not, in reality, sustain your position, since you admit that the experiment of free society has been but "*a short one.*"

In concluding these preliminary remarks, you must allow me to thank you for your imputations of a personal nature. I would be *just*, as well as *sincere*. And while I would avoid the vulgar ravings of a proscriptive or too impulsive disposition, I would as carefully guard against the obsequiousness of a weak, passive and servile nature. I like a manly, outspoken habit of expression, tempered with courtesy and kindness. If I wanted any thing more than the letter before me to render assurance doubly sure that a practical observance of these principles will be appreciated by you, I should find it in the assurance respecting you given me by that great man—Gerrit Smith.

The following paragraphs are answers to those of yours with corresponding numbers:—

First—If the instincts of human nature are always *right*, slavery is both right and wrong—an impossibility. If you mean *uneducated* instincts, you refute yourself, since you say that formerly slavery was discarded only by *savages*.

As man advances in *true* refinement, he *does* dispense with slavery. *Athenian* refinement was not such refinement.

Were Mexico and South America ever *less* barbarous than

they now are? How, then, has the abolition of slavery made them *more* barbarous?

Secondly—Yes. God allowed the Jews to hold slaves. He also allowed them, on account of the *hardness of their hearts*, to rid themselves of their wives at pleasure. Are your hearts equally *hard*, that you claim the right to indulge in such barbarous practices? But is a state of society adapted to such customs better than a more advanced state?

If we are infidels for not believing that the Bible sanctions slavery in this age of the world, our infidelity is preferable to your Christianity.

Thirdly—Is slavery the proper condition for intelligent beings, if it only fits them for pauperism and crime, which you say commenced with free society? Point me not to the evil effects of the old feudal slave system as the legitimate results of free society.

Fourthly—Has emancipation a deteriorating effect, morally, upon the slave? What, then, must be the moral effect of slavery upon the enslaved? Is the mental training of slavery such that your slaves, when left to themselves, are not yet capable of conducting themselves as intelligent beings? But, did your argument prove any thing to your purpose, it would still remain for you to show that the same argument would hold good in reference to the class of whites you would enslave. You say your slaves are trained to virtue, and then contradict it by representing them as becoming brutes when freed. You tell us of the viciousness of your free negroes; and yet, under the *genial* influences of free society here, your fugitive slaves become not only civil and virtuous, in general, but many of them rise to eminence in arts, sciences, and letters.

Fifthly—This sounding of trumpets as to the superior religious tone of society at the South, is becoming an old story. I have come to look for the least practical religion where there is the greatest noise about it. Your claims to a practical observance of the fundamental principles of Christianity, so beautifully exemplified in your system of human chatteldom, I will not now dispute. Perhaps I ought to rejoice in the perpetuation of so glorious an institution as that which has preserved for the world such encouraging fruits of "*faith and conscience*."

Sixthly—Certainly, sir, "Law, mere law, is inadequate to

govern the masses of mankind." There must be a sufficient development of the higher faculties of the mind to render civil enactments efficacious. And this is just what slavery tends to defeat. In your own State, there has always been a law against learning the mass of your population to read.

Yes, the Romans held a considerable portion of their population as slaves; they were a *civilized* people, and so are *you*. But is this any proof that a higher degree of civilization and refinement would not have been promoted by the *freedom* and *education* of the class enslaved?

Yes, New England hung witches and Quakers; and she held slaves, too. But she has attained a higher degree of civilization. You hunt with dogs, torture and murder human beings, for less offences—merely for seeking their freedom. And you are ready to hang every abolitionist who visits your coasts:—You are about where the New Englanders were in the days when they hung Quakers. Nor will you advance one step, but grow worse, till you rid yourselves of the barbarous institution of slavery.

So perfect, you insist, are the workings of your institution as to render police regulations unnecessary. And yet it is well known that ordinarily, even in rural districts, night patrols are general. Scattered all over the country are your packs of savage dogs, trained to pounce upon any nocturnal wanderer. These are a part of your police force. At this very moment, your periodicals are teeming with accounts of plots for the rising of the slaves, while wide-spread is the excitement and stir of arming against the slaves.

Seventhly—The proposition seems to me not a little exaggerated that we at the North were fed and clothed by you. You have 239,000 square miles of territory more than we have, with twice as much under cultivation. You have also one-third more persons engaged in agriculture than we have; and yet the value of your agricultural products is two hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars less than ours. And all this in a climate affording two and sometimes three crops in a year, and with a soil incomparably more fertile than ours.

If your "family negro" has "double the allowance" of the "Yankee laborer," the former must be a most beastly gormandizer; for the "Yankee laborer" has usually a pretty hearty relish for the abundance of excellent things with which most

of our farmers' tables are loaded. Let us look a little beyond the supply of merely the animal wants of the laborer. The Yankee laborer receives a pecuniary per diem "*allowance*" that enables himself and family to maintain something of a respectable position for intelligence and refinement. If you mean by your *family negro* your slaves in general, those of the plantation and all, I have only to say to you that we are quite well informed as to the scanty animal comforts enjoyed by the *family negro in general*. Doubtless in the older and slave-breeding States, some attention will be paid to the sleekness and moral character of your human stock. You would have them *religious*, for the same reason that you would have them *fat* and *happy*. And just here is a very strong argument against slavery. The improvement of the slave, from any other than base and sordid motives, is scarcely thought of.—You are so completely absorbed in this that almost your first argument is, the slave is well treated, as a matter of course, for "an immoral slave is *worth* nothing—an ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed slave is *worth* nothing." The principles of slavery have their location in the lower stratum of the mind—in the selfish region of the brain. They were "conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity." With us, reform principles are graduated by their tendency to develop, strengthen, and bring out the nobler traits of our mental being. You have a different scale entirely—a scale utterly unsuited to the improvement of *intelligent* beings. With us, the question is not what will improve the value of our brother man in *market*, but what will improve his value in *intelligence* and *true mental exaltation*? You argue *only* with reference to that which promotes the physical well-being of the slave; we reject that which promotes his physical comforts at the expense of an improved mental development. Hence, a Douglas in slavery, and a Douglas under the influence of free institutions, are characters vastly different. You make no attempt to prove that our ideas of reform are absolutely impracticable, but simply that our system does not yet realize your ideas of the proper condition of the masses. Nor do you attempt to prove that our ideas in this respect are defective. To do this would bring up the question whether the masses possess the minds of intelligent beings—the negative of which you no longer venture to scout even in regard to the race you enslave.

Eighthly—You say that “Christian morality is impracticable with us, because one can only be true to himself by doing wrong to others.” This is a begging of the question. It assumes as an argument the very thing to be proved. And how a man can be “true to himself by doing wrong to others,” is a query. But it remains for you to prove that the members of free society here are circumstantially *compelled* to be dishonest. But what sort of “Christian morality” would you have us adopt? You would have us re-organize on a basis which utterly repudiates the golden rule—without which there is no true *Christian morality*—“Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you.” You would have one portion of society here reduce the other portion to a state of slavery.—You cannot find one here who would prefer such a condition; and how, then, could he bring others into a condition that he would not have them bring him into, without discarding the very basis of all true Christian morality? You utterly confound all moral distinctions by talking of the master’s doing to the slave as he would be done by. Is the master willing to exchange conditions with the slave? You will say that he does to the slave as he would be done by if he was a slave.—This is not the point. In holding the slave as a slave, is he doing as he would be done by? You have drawn a very pleasing picture, surely, of the slave’s domestic relations to his master and his master’s family. I may draw one equally interesting respecting my dog or horse. What is the character of the good which the slave receives by promoting the interests of the master? He does not secure even the enjoyment of a knowledge of letters, for your laws absolutely forbid any such thing. He secures nothing that my horse or dog does not secure by faithful obedience to my commands. Yes, the slave, by being a slave, is free from the vexatious competition of free society; and so is my horse, by being a horse, free from such vexation.

Ninethly—Suppose abolitionists *were* all socialists, and all held free society to be a failure—would that prove slave society not to be a still greater failure? But I leave you and the socialists to settle this matter with yourselves.

We may differ among ourselves as to the best form of free society, and yet consistently advise you to rid yourselves of slavery—we regarding it as the worst possible form of society.

In one place you plant yourself upon the principle that "the greatest good of the greatest number" should be our object; but here you have it that "the good of one of the great and gifted" (the master) is rather to be consulted than the good of the many! But even on this principle you would fail, since the good of the "great and gifted" must be identical with the good of the greatest number!

You tell us that "much the larger portion of mankind, like children, are too *weak* and *ignorant* for the competition of life;" you also affirm that "nine-tenths of mankind" should be "ridden with a tight rein, and plentiful application of the whip and spur." Now, as a logical consequence, it properly belongs to you to prove, either that man is not susceptible of improvement, or that slave society, more than free society, tends to such development of the mental powers as removes this *ignorance* and *weakness*.

Tenthly—True, "*all* government should be adapted to the wants" of the governed. The wants of the slave are of a *mental* nature; the supply of which it is the object of your slave government to forbid or withhold.

Do you allude to free society *here*, when you assert that "the mass of the adult males are too improvident and vicious for self-government?" If not, it is nothing to the purpose. If you do, I call for the *proof*.

I think that were Mr. Fitzhugh better acquainted with society here, he would indulge less contempt for our "needlewomen, and factory and agricultural laborers." You appear not to be sufficiently aware of the general effects of our system of popular education. The very class *here* for which you appear to have such a hearty contempt are, as a general thing, far more intelligent, and worthy in every respect, than your medium class of slaveholders. Many of our ablest pioneers in every philanthropic and reformatory enterprise belong to the class in question. And nothing more forcibly illustrates the beneficent influences of our free institutions.

The condition of the poor, in the winter season, in such places as New York, which receive the whole mass of European emigrants, is no criterion for judging of the general condition of the society here.

Eleventhly—We do not tax the *poor*, but *property*. Would you *enslave* the "*virtuous and laborious poor*" to avoid being

imposed upon occasionally by the "*idle and vicious poor?*" To say that *good men* desire despotic power, is a contradiction in itself. But even if some good men do so much err in their philosophy as to fancy that they can be more useful to their race by being invested with despotic power, it by no means prove your position as to the utility of the exercise of such power. Many very wise and good men—some of them slaveholders—have and do repudiate your philosophy. I may instance WASHINGTON and JEFFERSON of the past, and your CASSIUS M. CLAY of the present; while at the North all our really great and wise men, at the head of whom stands our own GERRIT SMITH, wholly deprecate the notion that the petty despotism of the slave owner exerts any other than a pernicious influence upon the condition of man—retarding, as ever it must, the work of progression.

Twelfthly—The relation of master and slave is not founded in *natural* circumstances, but is wholly *arbitrary*, and therefore unnatural and unharmonious. Distinctions and gradations there are among men as in the natural world; but these distinctions can be harmonious only when *natural*. You do not found them on mental and other natural distinctions. Relations that restrain the harmonious development of the mental powers as does slavery, are unnatural and false.

As for "mobs and riots," if such are proof of a false state of society, no society furnishes more incontestible proofs of organic weakness and corruption than does your own form of society at the South. It is well known the world over, that the slave States of this Union are becoming the hot-bed of all such developments. Allow me to refer you to the many instances, of recent occurrence, in which worthy citizens of the South have, by mob violence, and threats of mobs, been driven from their homes, and some of them even murdered, for merely expressing opinions favorable to one of the Presidential candidates, himself a Southern man. You, sir, well know that for uttering abolition sentiments at the South, a man would be immediately handed over to the tender mercies of an infuriated mob—and all this while your ablest pro-slavery advocates are passing unmolested through the North, indulging, in the forum and in the social circle, the most vituperative language against the anti-slavery proclivities of the people.

Thirteenthly—Your philosophy of the cause of cheaper lands

at the South than here, is far from satisfactory. It is very true that "the profits of land determine its value." But your other premise is false—that the profits of land depend upon what the proprietor "extracts from the hireling." They depend upon no such thing; for if this were the case, lands would be highest at the South, where the laborer receives but a mere pittance, in the shape of cheap food and cheap clothing. My neighbor B.'s farm is worth forty dollars an acre, will sell for that, while C.'s farm, adjoining, the soil originally as good, the buildings as good, and other circumstances as favorable, is poor property at thirty dollars per acre. Now, why this disparity? The one pays the same wages as the other. The cause of the difference is to be traced to simply this—*difference in the economy or methods of farming*. Your fallacy is plainly *non causa pro causa*. Taking your maxim that the profits of land fix the price of land, it would naturally follow that the higher the land the higher the wages; especially here, where you say all avoid as much as possible agricultural labor. And this is precisely the case. When our farmers realize the best profits, they pay the best wages.

Such assertions as that the laborer here receives less than the Southern slave, I leave to the reader's own reflection.

Fourteenthly—Yes, *land monopoly* is an evil. But you cannot recommend *land reform*—a division of land among the landless, for you advocate the *enslavement* of the landless.—Land monopoly is the main pillar of the slavery system. The man who owns his hundreds of slaves must have a vast territory. What, then, is your remedy? Not the division of the lands, if you mean to be consistent. You could not even advise the great land-holders to parcel their lands out to the landless. No; those whom you say are so enslaved by capital you also aver are not capable of taking care of themselves. No, you would not have the land monopolist dispose of his lands in small parcels to the landless or common laborers, but you would have these lands stocked down with the poor, to be owned by the proprietor as goods, chattels, &c., like his cattle or swine. To have been consistent, you should have remonstrated with that prince of reformers, GERRIT SMITH, against the division of his extensive tracts among the landless. No, my friend, it is the *incapacity* of the laborer and the *competition of free society* that with you are sufficient bugbears

against any remedy short of the absolute enslavement of those who are so particularly the objects of your tender mercies.

Fifteenthly—From *what* are “the common laboring class” not sufficiently protected? You will say, “from the grinding oppression of the rich.” To afford them this protection, you would make them the property of the rich. You would place them wholly and entirely at the mercy of the very class from whose hard usage you would protect them. This is protection with a *vengeance*. To protect them from the hard exactions of capital, you would make them absolutely the slaves of capital. We are now taxing capital for the mental development and improvement of the “common laboring class,” and for the support and assistance of those whose circumstances require it. But have you any idea that capital would tax itself for the education of its slaves? Is this the case at the South? No—the very first thing capital would do would be to *forbid* the instruction of its slaves.

Are wives and children in general *enslaved*, held as *property*? They hold no such subordinate relation here. We think them a little above “lunatics and idiots.”

Sixteenthly—I repeat, that I leave you and the *socialists* to settle matters among yourselves. Again—if “the world is too little governed,” will you remedy the evil by giving to one portion of it the absolute ownership of the other portion—that portion, too, which is generally made to feel the full weight of civil authority?

Seventeenthly—The question is not whether *slavery* and *socialism* are in harmony. That has nothing to do with the issue as to the relative merits of the two forms of society, slave and free. Suppose the strong social feelings of the slaves are gratified by hoarding them together in large families: if simply this makes them contented with a condition that violates the laws that govern the development of the higher and nobler faculties, your argument proves too much.

Yes, slavery associates “labor and capital,” but associates *labor* and *wages* on precisely the same principle that the labor and wages of the horse and ox are associated. To talk of *wages* in connection with slavery, or to associate the two, is the merest absurdity. Of course, the enslavement of the brute “associates labor and capital,” and renders them more produc-

tive. If the slave is so much better off than the free laborer, how comes it that the former seeks the condition of the latter?

Eighteenthly—Labor is here by no means so dependent on capital as you represent. The demand for labor is greater than you appear to be aware of. Why did you not go into details as to the rates of wages? The employer will hire as cheaply as he can, but that is of no consequence as long as the demand for labor is kept up. Now, sir, I will venture the assertion that two-thirds of our laboring young men who commence the world with nothing, become men of property. Enough of them, at least, become men of property to demonstrate that labor has a fair chance with capital. I believe that every thinking and observing man at the North will concur with me in this. Many of our common laborers have families, and as a general thing those families are comfortably fed and clothed, and all of them more or less educated, into the bargain. If these are facts, and I defy you to prove to the contrary, (not by presenting what Mr. Such-an-one says,) it is sheer nonsense to talk of our laborers not receiving as much as your slaves.

When you convince the South that "free labor is cheaper than slave labor," the days of your peculiar institution will soon be numbered. In vain may you plead for the establishment of slavery here if this is to be received as an axiom.

Labor here is not taxed for the profits of capital to the extent that you represent. Improved methods of production in manufactures and agriculture increase the rates of wages, and at the same time enhance the profits of capital. In free society there is enterprise, and where there is enterprise there is invention and improvement; and where there is invention and improvement, better profits are realized on capital, and consequently better wages can be afforded, and will be paid while the present demand for labor continues. This I believe to be the true philosophy of the matter.

Nineteenthly—If your slaves have no *cares* or *responsibilities*, you had better put them in a condition to have cares and responsibilities, by freeing them. I would not dare to bring up a child without cares and responsibilities. I may say as much of my horse, that he is without cares or responsibilities. It needs these cares and responsibilities to impart mental *stamina*—to give energy, strength, and power of judgment to the mind. So, then, this argument may be turned against your-

self. The very class here that you would enslave, in general possess most talent and energy. Free society imposes upon them the very *cares* and *responsibilities* that call into vigorous exercise those powers of mind which distinguish man from the brute creation; and to this circumstance is to be attributed the fact that most of our distinguished men and women have risen from comparative obscurity.

In your cities, have you no *idlers* among the rich? It is the tendency of your form of society to engender idleness, not only among the rich, but among the *poor*. And this, I must conclude, is what you mean by calling the poor at the South "*a privileged*" class. The tendency of your system to beget general idleness among the whites may account for what is now an historical fact in regard to the miserable condition of the poor whites, and the dissolute habits of so many of the rich.

This brings me to your notice of my letter of April 12th.

In regard to the slave traffic, you do go so far as to deplore the separation of *master* and slave! Is this the extent of your tender mercies for the slave? The merciless rending of domestic and family ties among the slaves is not taken into account at all! Familiarity with these worse than savage cruelties begets indifference even in minds otherwise noble and generous. Your attempt to gloss over these matters, and your pretence that they are, after all, quite beneficent in their operations, is sufficient proof of this.

Whether there is more or less concubinage at the South than at the North, is not the point. What I referred to as particularly abhorrent and revolting was the master's trafficking *in his own flesh and blood*. In your work entitled "*Cannibals All*," we hope you have paid some attention to this worse than barbarous usage.

Public opinion at the South, you say, will not allow the discussion of what is gross, licentious, infidel or agrarian! This is probably the reason why you will not tolerate the discussion of *slavery*.

If your free negroes are the only *vicious class* among you, you will find here a state of society under the influences of which your free negroes, with few exceptions, become good citizens.

If the case of your friend R. is *exceptional*, what are we to do with the pictures which you have elsewhere drawn of the

general character of the slaves, and their devotion to the interests of their masters?

If man does not begin to be *intellectual* and *moral* till his physical wants are supplied, how comes it that our common laborers are in general intelligent and moral? *Their* physical wants must have been tolerably well supplied.

I repeat that I have nothing to do with the "*old countries.*" I have a right to select the best tried experiments of free society.

Very truly and sincerely yours,

A. HOGEBROOM.

FROM GEORGE FITZHUGH.

PORT ROYAL, Va., November 18th, 1856.

Dear Sir:—It may be probably not amiss that I explain myself as to the changes which I should advocate in your system of society. I should not, at present, deem it advisable to make your laboring class hereditary domestic slaves. It is better that those who can remove should migrate west and become land proprietors. But they had far better go west as domestic slaves than as a tenantry. Land monopoly begets a slavery to capital that is more cruel and exacting and less tolerable than domestic slavery. The tenantry labor under the disabilities of slaves, have to work harder and longer, for less allowance, and have none of the rights of domestic slaves. This subject is well understood in New York, for it has long been a theme of discussion, and sometimes of legislative and judicial action. It is more profitable to buy lands and stock them with a free white tenantry, as the Emigration Aid Society is doing, than with negro slaves, as the Border Ruffians propose. But the latter is much the more humane procedure.

Whilst I would not make your laboring class generally slaves until all the lands of the west are monopolized, yet I would suffer women who were destitute and encumbered with small children to sell themselves and children for life, or for a term of years, and permit agricultural laborers to sell themselves for a year at a time, as sailors and soldiers do for several years.

In fine, I would inculcate the slavery principle as the essential principle of almost all government, to be applied more generally as society becomes more dense, and the number of the weak and helpless increases. "When one human being is governed, not by law, but by the will of another human being," he is the slave of that human being so governing him. Such is now the condition of your women, your children, your soldiers, your idiots and lunatics, and your convicts. With the additions I propose to make, white slavery would be the ordinary and normal condition of the people of the North. It is certainly the natural and generally necessary condition of humanity. Repudiate at the North the doctrine of human equality, and adopt the principle that domestic slavery of some kind is the proper, natural and necessary condition of most human beings, and you will gradually get rid of all your social, religious and political heresies, and build up, from time to time, a system of social polity suited to the rapidly changing circumstances and exigencies of a growing and new society. Your philosophy is more at fault than your practice. You have plenty of well regulated domestic slaves among you in the various relations of life, which your social philosophers very improperly are attempting to abolish. But

The rapidly increasing prices of coffee, cotton, sugar, and other negro slavery products, should remind you that your success in liberating the slaves of the West Indies and of South America has recoiled on the whites. Could you liberate all the negroes, you would starve Western Europe, (a third of whose food and clothing is the product of slave labor,) and well nigh starve your own North.

"There is a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough hew them as we will."

You have increased the demand for slaves, and more than doubled the slave trade, (including the cooly trade,) whilst (wholly against your intentions) you have quadrupled its cruelty. Besides, you have made an opening for such filibuster and border ruffian philanthropists as HOUSTON, TAYLOR, SCOTT, WALKER, STRINGFELLOW and ATCHISON. You abolitionists, if not indirectly in yourselves, have been the "cause of riot in others." To you we are indebted for such men as I have enumerated, whose memories will descend to posterity along with those of HERCULES, MOSES, JOSHUA, SAMSON, CORTEZ, PIZAR-

ro, Captain JOHN SMITH of Virginia, the PILGRIM FATHERS, &c. as the true benefactors of mankind—men who have exterminated, or tamed and enslaved savages, not nursed them.—The world has decided a unanimous verdict that theirs is true philosophy—yours false and mischievous philanthropy. Despite of your opposition, these men, and such as they, will succeed in extending the area of negro slavery, in reviving the civilization of Mexico and South America, in greatly diminishing the price of all slave and tropical products, and consequently in lessening the labor, improving the comfort and elevating the condition of laboring white men. Coffee, sugar, cotton, rice, tobacco, molasses, and all tropical fruits will become cheap and plentiful. The market for the manufactures and other products of the North and Western Europe will become illimitable, and no white man need work as a common hireling in the field, for his services will be wanted in more skillful and less laborious occupations. You would starve or degrade the white laborer—the filibusters, slave traders and border ruffians will vastly improve his physical and social condition.

Nothing preserves this Union but the mutual dependence of the North and South. Their labor and their products being different, they afford customers and a market to each other. Slavery is the bond and cement that keep us together. Destroy that, and North and South will engage in similar industrial pursuits, and soon become rivals and enemies of each other.

I think experience shows that the greatest good you can confer on the savage African is to make him an American slave, and retain him and his posterity as such. Missionaries can neither civilize or christianize him, and when slavery has civilized and christianized him, emancipation soon restores him to the savage, Pagan state.

You, no doubt, think the savage, Pagan, Cannibal state preferable to that of civilized slavery. It is a mere difference of taste, and I will not attempt to convince or confute you.—Distinguished philosophers have contended that the savage state was the best condition of man. I believe, however, that we discuss our subject before a christian, civilized community, who consider the condition of the savage idolater the worst in which a human being can be placed, and who have, therefore,

decided that Southern slavery is preferable to African negro liberty.

The African slave trade is calculated, if not to abolish war among the negroes, at least to change its character, for it sets the savages to *catching* instead of *killing* and *eating* each other. In the absence of laws prohibiting it, the self-interest of the traders would secure its humane prosecution. Slaves are the most valuable live stock, and the trader is sure to use his utmost exertions to preserve their health and spirits; for slaves sell much better when they are cheerful and contented, whilst a cargo of dead negroes is about the worst speculation in the world. The domestic slave trade is necessary and allowable, though not always humane. The foreign slave trade, untrammelled by law, opens to view the widest field of philanthropy ever yet exhibited to mankind.

Two hundred millions of illy clad, half starved and over-worked whites in Europe and America are impatiently awaiting a larger and cheaper supply of slave products, whilst a hundred millions of Cannibal savages are living in hopeless idleness and idolatry, because pseudo philanthropy has made the missionary efforts of the slave trade a capital offence.

The slave trade has been carried on to excess, and is wrong when negro men fall to two hundred dollars a piece, for then negroes in families are expensive. Men take little care of them, become conscientious about holding slaves, and begin to set them free to starve. Liberating slaves, white or black, in large numbers, is wholesale crime, which deserves capital punishment, for it is a successful effort by their masters of relieving themselves of the obligation to support those whom they have deprived of the means of supporting themselves. About the time of our Revolution the supply of slaves exceeded the demand for the products of slave labor. It was well to stop the slave trade, but cruelly wrong to permit emancipation without provision for the emancipated.

Now, negro men are current at twelve hundred dollars each. The slave trade has revived in spite of law. It should be legalized and encouraged.

To enslave men is almost universally a most humane and beneficent providence, for it is only practiced on those who need protection, and the history, laws and social practices of all ages and all countries prove that we can only efficiently pro-

fect those who are subject to our will and control, and who are in fact slaves.

I am not, sir, satisfied with justifying slavery. The enormous price of negroes and of slave products, and the starving condition of free white society, show that negro slavery must be increased and extended.

The demoralized, disorganized, sceptical, aimless, anarchical, agrarian condition of free society loudly calls for a tightening of the reins of government, and a larger infusion of the slavery principle and practice into its social frame-work. "The world is too little governed." It will go to wreck if a new theory and practice of government, social, political and religious, is not soon introduced. "*We must have a new world, if we are to have any world at all!*"

Your engagements having delayed your answer to my letter of 26th September, I write this to supply deficiencies in that. Having retained no copy of it, I may, in some instances, unnecessarily repeat my arguments. At least, I have attempted to present the subject in a more practical form. It is probable that by publishing this letter, along with that of 26th September, and replying to each, we shall have written as much as will interest the public.

With great respect, your obedient servant,

GEORGE FITZHUGH.

FROM A. HOGEBROOM.

SHEP'S CORNERS, Madison County, N. Y., }
January 2d, 1857. }

GEORGE FITZHUGH, ESQ.:

Dear Sir:—I now take up your letter of November 18th. You would not make our “laboring class” slaves *at present*. You would have them settle on land in the west. But what would you do with those who do not emigrate? Would you defer so great a blessing merely to keep open a chance for a few, comparatively, to emigrate? But if the common laboring class is in the mental condition in which you elsewhere represent them to be, why send them west to become *land proprietors*? Why not give your slaves a chance to become *land proprietors*? Are they “*weak and ignorant*,” &c.? You say the same of our laborers.

Is the Emigration Aid Society stocking lands with a *tenantry*? Are they not helping them become *land proprietors*? The border ruffian system of stocking with slaves you think to be “much more the humane.” Yes, and if slave society is so much better than free society, it would be much the more humane for our State Governments to bring all poor people to the auction block, that the rich might emigrate to Kansas with their white slaves.

How do you suppose slavery is ever to be established here on the *voluntary* principle? Do you fancy that the Yankees will voluntarily become slaves, while you have to stand guard over even your own negro slaves to keep them slaves? After all, you are not for *perpetual* slavery here, but for slavery that lasts only a year at a time. Now, if you will only adopt this system at the South, and make the renewal of the lease *volun-*

tary on the part of the enslaved class, the abolitionists will give you no more trouble. But, if you are for the establishment of slavery here only on the *voluntary* principle, I regard it as an abandonment of your position. How can you recommend slavery as the "*essential principal of almost all government,*" and yet advise that it may be made *individually optional*? But if the establishment of slavery here (white slavery, of course,) is to be placed among the functions of government, when would you have government assume this *new and sacred* responsibility?

You pertinaciously contend that our wives are *slaves*. You may be under the reign of such barbarism. It is one of the evils of your form of society. We glory in *woman's rights*.

What you call "social, religious and political heresies," are simply social, religious and political *progression*.

Allowing that West India and South American emancipation have raised the price of Southern products, is simply *that* any argument against free society? It might cheapen Northern products to reduce the poor here to the condition of your Southern slaves. The rich could afford these products much cheaper were they to expend upon themselves and families what now goes to educate and enlighten the poor, and supply them with good clothing, and generally many of the luxuries of life. It would, doubtless, raise the price of cotton on Red River were the *Lagrees* of that region compelled to pay their laborers as we pay ours, and besides, to submit to a tax on their property for the general education and enlightenment of the poor; and further, to afford them the opportunities for improving these advantages. Our poorer classes are enjoying many of their luxuries at the expense of the ignorance, suffering, and unrequited toil of the slave millions. Is this acting upon the principle of "*the greatest good of the greatest number*?" Give the West India laborers a fair recompense for their toil, and those regions will be rendered much more productive than they ever were in the palmiest days of slavery. And though the tables of the rich here and elsewhere may not groan under the burden of cheap luxuries wrung from the suffering and unpaid toil of millions, still the philanthropist would have the consolation of knowing that those once unhappy and enslaved millions were put upon a footing to make them feel that they are human beings, and to incite them to rise from

that brutal ignorance and degradation in which slavery leaves them. No, you cannot prove even negro slavery to be any other than a curse. But you are to bear in mind that the question is *general*; and even though you proved slavery to be the best condition of the African in reference both to themselves and the whites, still your task would be far from completed.

I must remark here that the world is not quite so dependent on negro slave labor as you would have us suppose. Besides, we believe that a properly regulated system of free negro labor would render the products of Southern climes vastly more abundant than they are under the operation of the slave system.

Yes, "*there is a divinity that shapes our ends,*" and that divinity will rule slavery out of the world ere long.

You are right that we have increased the demand for slaves. We have a government that has been spreading the broad panoply of its power over the slave system, not only to *protect*, but to *spread* it. But slavery will not always have this protection; and besides, the day is near at hand when you will think less of the slave trade—when the insurrectionary spirit of your slave population will make you feel that you have Africans enough in your midst. But pray, Sir, what has the increased demand for slaves to do with the question whether slave society is the best form of society in general? Has it any logical or philosophical bearing on the question?

If you are indebted to the abolitionists for such men as STRINGFELLOW and ARCHISON, you have certainly great reason to curse us. But certainly, Sir, your moral condition at the South must be bad indeed if you are only driven deeper into wickedness by the well-meaning efforts of abolitionists. Surely you have great reason to be jealous of a moral condition that impels you to repudiate your great WASHINGTON and your JEFFERSON, and fall to adoring such cut-throats as *Archison* and *Stringfellow*!

Is the world agreed that slavery is "*true philanthropy*?" In a Southern Convention recently, it was argued by your ablest men that the slave trade is repugnant to the feelings of the civilized world.

Yes, while this pro-slavery government continues to lend itself to the extension of slavery, you may boast of your
 that the slave trade is repugnant to the feelings of the civilized world.

flibustering projects. But, Sir, be not too sanguine in exercising your gifts of prophecy.

Truly, what a slavery millenium we are to have! South America and Mexico too! What a superabundance of the good things of life slavery has in store for the world! With a climate granting two and sometimes three crops in a year—with a soil incomparably more fertile than ours—with 232,000 square miles of territory more than we have—with twice as much land under cultivation as we have, and one-third more persons engaged in farming, the value of your agricultural products per year is two hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars less than the value of ours, and only about one-half as much per acre. No, sir—slavery would starve the world. It is the stimulus which free society gives to enterprise and industry that is to feed and clothe mankind. I could but repeat the above fact, as it is so important in its bearing.

You are for the establishment of white slavery, and yet you are going to exempt every white man from field labor! Well, as to the latter, you see we are rather inexorably set upon sharing in the labors of the field. We would elevate and dignify labor. Within the last dozen years I have, with very little assistance, cleared up a small farm, and have found such employment quite as healthful as that of reading *BLACKSTONE*; and, what may seem strange and vulgar to you, I am proud of the achievement. Curse us no more with slavery if it is going to degrade white labor.

You admit that the abolition of slavery would enlarge the field of industrial pursuits at the South, and bring her into rivalry in this respect with the North. Thank you for this admission in favor of free society. By thus diversifying your pursuits, you would be in a far better condition to clothe and feed the world. Suppose you try the experiment.

It is something of an admission that the "savage African" is capable of being "civilized and christianized." How much of an agent slavery is in this good work, let the general condition of your slaves and your treatment of them decide.—What was prophecy in my former letters has but too soon become a matter of history. These civilized, christianized, well fed, happy and contented beings, so strongly attached to their masters, have now thrown the South into a prodigious excitement, under the apprehension that the slaves are about to play the savage by cutting the throats of the whites.

Yes, Sir, we are discussing this question before a "civilized community;" and to this community I say that I should prefer my child to grow up a "*savage Pagan*," with the prospect of his posterity becoming civilized, than to have him and his posterity become the victims of slavery under a system which, after a long tried experiment, ends only in such results. But a short time since the Sandwich Islanders were "*savage idolaters*"—now they are outstripping the mass of your population in civilization and refinement.

When you shall have proved slavery a *blessing*, it will be time enough to discuss the merits of the African slave trade. This disposition, however, to return to this barbarous custom, is but another proof of the demoralizing influence of slavery upon the South. Your plausibility in support of this accursed business seems to me very much like "*stealing the livery of Heaven to serve the devil in.*" If there is no other "*divinity that shapes our ends*" than the genius that prompts to a defence of the *African slave trade*, we had better all become *devil worshippers* at once.

You repeatedly urge that the poor people here *need more protection*; and although you are going to have *all* white men raised above *labor*, still you now repeat that to *enslave* those who need more protection is "*a most humane and beneficent procedure.*"

I am happy to see Mr. FITZHUGH falling back upon negro slavery. Would that his convictions about white slavery had really underwent any change.

How "*the enormous price of negroes*" justifies their *enslavement*, I do not comprehend. It goes very well, however, on the principle that "*might makes right*," and that the South depends very much for support on her speculations in human flesh and blood.

If "*free white society*" is actually in "*a starving condition*," there is certainly very little to hope for from slavery, since it has as yet nowhere developed more than one-fourth of the resources of a country. The plain truth is, Mr. FITZHUGH, it is the impetus which free society gives to enterprise and industry that averts a world of misery which would otherwise result from the paralyzing effects of slavery upon industrial pursuits. We have figures and facts for this, and will bring them forward if the controversy is continued.

You will say the negroes at the South would not work if emancipated. What! after having so long experienced the civilizing and christianizing influences of slavery! What stronger argument have we against the deteriorating influences of slavery? At the North the colored people are as industrious as any other class.

It is slavery that will eventually "wreck" any country or government where it is perpetuated.

Truly yours,

A. HOGBOOM.